

APPENDIX A

Meeting Minutes



**SR 9 CORRIDOR STUDY
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
MEETING SUMMARY**

A *Citizens' Advisory Committee* (formerly known as the *Advisory Group*) meeting was held at 2:00 pm on **September 23, 2002** at the Keith J. McClarnon Government Center in Greenfield, Indiana.

Those in attendance* were:

Management Committee

Mr. Bradley Davis, Bob Rebling	INDOT Greenfield District
Mr. Dan Buck	INDOT Planning
Ms. Mary Wright	INDOT Public Hearings
Ms. Joyce Newland	FHWA
Mr. Blake Wilson	Shrewsberry & Associates
Ms. Jacey Leonard	Cripe
Mr. Matthew Crane, Derek Schoon	Cripe

Citizens' Advisory Committee

Mr. Rodney Fleming	Mayor, City of Greenfield
Mr. Richard Pasco	Greenfield City Council
Ms. Donieta Ross	Council for Economic Development
Ms. Linda Imel	Greenfield Chamber of Commerce
Mr. Randall Shields	Greenfield Daily Reporter
Mr. Edward Ebert, Ken Smith	Central Soya
Mr. Joe Copeland	Hancock County Engineer
Mr. Tom Roney	Hancock County Council
Ms. Jenna Roy	Historic Landmarks Foundation (IN)
Ms. Rosalie Richardson	Greenfield Historic Landmarks
Mr. Bobby Keen	Hancock Memorial Hospital
*Mr. Mike Fruth	Greenfield City Engineer
*Mr. Wayne DeLong	Greenfield City Planner
*Mr. Thom Bennett	KIPT / Keihin

*Not in attendance, but provided comment for purposes of the meeting

The purpose of the meeting was to update the CAC on the progress of the study, primarily the draft results of the Purpose and Need.

As some of the members of the CAC were new to the group, Mr. Crane opened the meeting with an overview of the study's development plan and schedule. The findings of the need and purpose development were then presented to the group.

Participants of the meeting were seated in small groups of four or five during the meeting. A map of the study area with conceptual alternatives was provided to each group and participants were encouraged during the meeting to mark up the map with their comments or thoughts regarding their assessment of the current problem, possible alternative solutions, or simply general community information which may add value to the study.

Participants asked several specific clarifying questions regarding the material which was being presented during the meeting. These questions were answered as they came up. Several other issues and comments which were brought up during the meeting by the CAC, which seemed to provide feedback and positive insight into the problem analysis.

(The following is our summarization of the general thoughts and summary of the meeting. It is not an attempt to capture every comment verbatim or serve as minutes of the meeting. We did attempt to document the major views or issues were addressed by the participants)



- The group generally agreed the lack of other major “north-south” roadways to handle local intra-city traffic may be contributing to the current capacity and safety problems along SR 9.
- The fact that there is only one interchange with I-70 in the Greenfield area was noted. Other cities of similar size have multiple interchanges. This creates somewhat of a bottleneck for traffic going to I-70.
- When I-70 is closed due to an accident, construction, etc., even partially, Greenfield becomes clogged as I-70 traffic is detoured through Greenfield. ITS was suggested as a possible solution to this issue.
- Comments were made regarding the poor roadway geometry along the corridor in particular in the downtown area near the SR 9/US 40 intersection. Due to small turning radii, it is extremely difficult for trucks to turn at this intersection. This, in turn, clogs the intersection, not allowing other vehicles to get through the green light. It was felt the simple presence of the trucks and lack of facilities to accommodate them is at the root of the problem, as opposed to too many truck or a capacity issue.
- The operational problems which are being caused by the trucks along SR 9 are contributing to the difficulties which emergency vehicles have in being able to quickly get through the area.
- It was requested that a more specific breakdown of accident locations beyond a urban/rural breakdown should be evaluated to refine the actual safety deficiencies. An analysis of accidents in the five lane section versus the 2 lane section of SR 9 through the city limits was suggested.
- The group was generally surprised by the results of the O-D Study, particularly the volume of trucks which daily pass through the city. It was questioned the seasonal variability of the truck volumes, especially around harvest time.
- A comment was made questioning the percentage of trucks which enter the study area and may only have business in the distribution center area near I-70. How does this effect our conclusions regarding the results of the O-D Study?
- It was suggested that an improved signal timings along the corridor from US 40 to I-70 may improve traffic flow through this portion of the corridor.
- Both CR 600E and CR 200W were mentioned (through map markups) as possible “bypass” options.





**SR 9 CORRIDOR STUDY
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A **Public Information Meeting** was held at 7:00 pm on **September 23, 2002** at the Greenfield Fire Station (downtown) in Greenfield, Indiana.

Approximately 21 individuals from the public attended the meeting. Additionally, those in attendance from the study's Management Committee were:

Mr. Bradley Davis & Bob Rebling	INDOT Greenfield District
Mr. Dan Buck	INDOT Planning
Ms. Mary Wright	INDOT Public Hearings
Ms. Joyce Newland	FHWA
Mr. Matthew Crane, Derek Schoon	Cripe

The purpose of the meeting was to update the public on the progress of the study, primarily the draft results of the Purpose and Need and gain insight into our findings. The meeting also served as a call for interested individuals to join or recommend individuals to the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC).

Mr. Crane opened the meeting with an overview of the study's development plan, schedule, The findings of the need and purpose were then presented to the group.

A formal question and answer period was held and an opportunity to make a public statement was given to those interested.

The following represents a summary of the comments and views made by the public during the meeting:

- Would like to see a more defined breakdown of accident data (specific locations); particularly interested in the breakdown north versus south of McKenzie Street
- Interested in the more specific information regarding the heavy vehicle makeup of the OD Study (semi-trailers versus other types of "heavy vehicles")
- Concerned about pedestrian safety along the corridor, especially in the "downtown" area. Widening may eliminate current buffer between sidewalk and road.
- "Quality of Life" issues such as aesthetics, landscaping, pedestrian and alternative modes of transportation, should be considered during the alternatives screening process.
- Seasonal events, such as harvesting, will have an impact on congestion in the area
- Service roads along SR 9 such as those currently near I-70, may help alleviate traffic in that area.
- Widening SR 9 or creating other major north-south corridors will be the only way to address the current problem
- Do not allow trucks on SR 9 from New Road to Davis Road. Use New Road, Meridian Street and Davis road as a truck route. Improve these routes as necessary to accommodate this traffic pattern



- Although people in general do not want trucks on SR 9, when the Post Office presented a proposal to relocate from the downtown area due to the truck traffic generated, the public “vetoed” that idea, thus keeping that traffic on SR 9.
- It is not the number of trucks, but their sheer presence which is “clogging” the system, particularly at the intersection of SR 9 and US 40.
- Although the area from I-70 to McKenzie has been widened, it does not “flow” very well due to the current signal timings through that stretch.
- There is a bottleneck at where SR 9 transitions from five lanes down to two or three.
- A new development is going in west of the city, which will include 1600 new homes, and a new school.
- The signal at McKenzie Road is not timed properly.
- ITS or video detection or reversible lanes should be examined as an option to building new roads
- When I-70 is closed or restricted due to an emergency or accident, traffic is detoured down SR 9 creating gridlock situations, making it nearly impossible to get emergency vehicles to and from the scene.
- Greenfield seems to be the only city this size with only 1 interchange
- SR 9 between I-70 and New Road does experience congestion at rush hour
- Some quick fix projects may be
 - Do not allow left turns between Hospital and Lincoln St.
 - Route trucks along New Road and CR 200S
 - Right turn only going south starting at McDonalds.
- Is 3000 trucks consistent with other cities?
- Surprised by volume of trucks through area.
- Concerned about safety to roadside buildings and business in downtown with heavy trucks so near to them
- Do not run a bypass road down the east side of the city.
- Traffic issue is not near I-70, but rather in the downtown area.
- Need to eliminate trucks on SR 9, but bypass will just spur more growth and move the problem, not solve it.
- Traffic data may be stale, much has changed in the area since 1999.
- Pinch point along corridor is at McKenzie and SR 9. The signal is not timed correctly. A simple fix will greatly improve flow in the area.
- Commuter traffic is all traveling north on SR 9 and east on I-70.



**SR 9 CORRIDOR STUDY
INTERAGENCY COORDINATION MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

An *Interagency Coordination Meeting* for the **SR 9 Environmental Assessment / Corridor Study** was held on **December 19, 2002** at the Holiday Inn Express in Greenfield, Indiana. The following individuals were in attendance:

Management Committee

Mr. Robert Rebling	INDOT Greenfield District
Ms. Lori McCarter	INDOT Greenfield District
Ms. Mary Wright	INDOT Public Hearing Section
Mr. Jim Juricic	INDOT Environmental Assessment
Mr. Dan Buck	INDOT Long Range Planning
Mr. Steve Smith	INDOT Long Range Planning
Ms. Joyce Newland	FHWA
Mr. Matthew Crane	Paul I. Cripe, Inc.
Mr. Brett VanderMolen	Paul I. Cripe, Inc.
Mr. Mark Matasic	Shrewsbury & Associates

Participating Agencies

Mr. Forest Clark	USFWS
Mr. Brian Boszor	IDNR
Ms. Virginia Laszewski	EPA-Region 5
(via teleconference)	

Prior to the meeting, the participating agencies were sent a copy of the study's *Statement of Need and Purpose*, dated November 22, 2002, and asked to provide comment. **The deadline for providing comment is February 1, 2003.** The purpose of this meeting was to give those interested federal and state level participating agencies an opportunity to ask questions or gain additional insight into the study in an effort to aid formulation of their comments. A site visit was offered, but not accepted by any of the meeting's attendees.

Mr. Crane began the meeting with an overview of the study and its findings to the group. The participating agencies expressed several comments and issues which will require further follow-up or revisions to the study documents. A summary of these comments and the proposed actions (as preliminarily discussed in the meeting) follows:

Comment: Based on the origin-destination (O-D) study, it does not appear a bypass would be warranted considering only 6% of traffic which travels on SR 9 is north-south through traffic. (EPA, IDNR)

Proposed Action Item: The merits of a bypass as compared with its potential environmental impacts will be analyzed as part of the alternatives screening process, the next phase of the study.



Comment: Transit options should be evaluated (EPA)

Proposed Action Item: Greenfield does not currently have a transit system (bus, etc.) A transit alternative will be incorporated as part of the alternatives screening process, most likely as a “local” solution.

Comment: Alternate 4 appears confusing...consider revising this alternate group to include 1) a true no build alternate or “baseline” (which would include both current state and locally committed or programmed projects); 2) locally funded improvements (off-state system) only ; 3) combination of alternatives (EPA)

Proposed Action Item: Future development of the alternatives will incorporate these groupings (or similar) for clarity.

Many of the comments and questions made during the meeting were of a clarifying nature and were handled as they were addressed. The following is a summary of these clarifications:

- The funds allocated in TEA-21 were designated to “Construct a SR 9 Bypass in Greenfield” Funding for the selected action or alternate will need to be revised in the future should a bypass not be selected.
- The Community Advisory Committee (CAC) is a dynamic group of individuals open to representatives of the business, government (city and county), and civic community. It does have members of local community groups as part of the committee. It is an open group and its membership has increased as the study has proceeded. We have used to group to gain insight into problem definition, clarification of existing conditions, and possible alternatives.
- Planners from both City and County have been coordinated with as part of this study.
- Most of western Hancock County from SR 9 to the Marion-Hancock county line has been zoned non-agricultural.
- LOS values were determined using existing and projected average daily traffic volumes.
- Local mobility is being defined as intra-area (in this case the greater Greenfield area) travel. It became apparent during the development of the need and purpose, that there appears to be a local mobility issue, particularly in the north-south direction. The core or primary purpose of the any improvements in the area is to improve the safety and level of service along SR 9. Addressing deficiencies in local mobility is a secondary need for purposes of this study.

- Comments received from the CAC or public through coordination meetings (see attached) have either been incorporated into the development of the need and purpose, or will be addressed during the alternatives screening process.
- A travel demand model is being developed as part of this study to predict the impact of various alternatives and growth patterns on the existing and future roadway system. The results of this model will be used in the analysis of the alternatives.
- Critical to the alternatives analysis is the impact and subsequent effect the current and predicted future truck traffic (as well as its seasonal variation) has on system performance. These effects are of concern to the local community.
- The "downtown main street" area for the city of Greenfield generally extends along several blocks from the intersection of both SR 9 and US 40
- The purpose of the next meeting, roughly scheduled for April 2003, will be to update the purpose and need, and discuss the development, and subsequent screening of various alternatives.
- The final corridor study, which will recommend which alternatives (or combination thereof) should be carried forward for further study, is scheduled to be complete in July 2003.

This is our understanding of the comments, and issues developed during the meeting. Participating agencies are asked to review this material to ensure we have effectively captured your concerns. If you concur, please kindly coordinate with us your concurrence. However, if you feel our summary does not accurately convey your issues or you would like to provide additional comments, we encourage you to submit these in writing by the February 1, 2003 deadline.

Should you have any additional questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,
PAUL I. CRIPE, INC.



Matthew J. Crane, P.E.
 Project Manager
cramat@picripe.com

Date: December 24, 2002

c: Attendees
 Management Committee
 Participating Agencies

